

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-19, 38-42, 45-47, 49, 50, 53-63 are currently pending with claims 1, 15, 38, 45, and 59 being independent. No claim is allowed.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12-16, 38, 39, 45-47, 49, 50, and 53-60 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention.

Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 46, 47, 49, 50, and 53-58 have been amended at least in part to correct antecedent basis.

Claims 12, 14, 56, and 58 have been amended in part to change their dependency.

Claims 4, 8, 20, 22, 24-37, 43, 44, 48, 52, 64, and 65 have been newly canceled, without prejudice.

Petition for Revival

Included with this paper is a Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally Under 37 CFR 1.137(b). On September 14, 2000 a Revocation of Attorney and Power of Attorney was filed with the USPTO. Apparently, this was never made effective by the Office and future mailings continued to be sent to the prior counsel. Consequently, the Final Office Action dated November 15, 2002 was never received by our office. Our failure to respond to the Final Office Action was unintentional.

Given that the error that resulted in the unintentional abandonment of the application was the fault of the Office, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Petition be granted and that the fee associated with the Petition be refunded.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-6, 8-20, 22, 24-29, 31-50, and 52-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Miller et al.* (US 5,946,647) in view of *Shachar* (US 6,012,102) and *Pandit* (US 5,859,636). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Generally, the Office Action states that *Miller* discloses or suggests most of the claim elements and that common knowledge, *Shachar*, and *Pandit* disclose or suggest the rest.

It is noted that claims 4, 8, 20, 22, 24-37, 43, 44, 48, 52, 64, and 65 have been canceled with this paper and thus the rejection with respect to these claims is rendered moot.

Further, with this paper, independent claims 1, 15, 38, 45, and 59 have been amended to include or emphasize elements or limitations that are not disclosed or suggested in the cited prior art. As variously claimed, the combination of a Web page server, an access server, and an access device performing or configured as claimed is not disclosed or suggested.

In view of the above, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Request for Allowance

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and an early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

If any matters remain which could be resolved in a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite resolution of any such matters.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN, REID, & PRIEST LLP

Dated: September 16, 2003



David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Thelen, Reid, & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 292-5800